

EDMS FCG ACMS Status Meeting 13 - 16 January 1998

Summary of Meeting

On the 13th through 16th of January 1998, the Army Materiel Command (AMC) Engineering Data Management (EDMS) Functional Coordinating Group (FCG) held a meeting at Orlando, FL. Mr. Charlie Goodwin, STRICOM, hosted the meeting. The meeting's purpose was to accomplish the following:

- Receive training on MIL-STD-2549, Configuration Management Interface Standard.
- Review and revise the draft ACMS performance requirements.

Mr. Gordon Ney from the U.S. Army Material System Analysis Activity (AMSAA) chaired the meeting. Approximately 20 representatives from the various Major Subordinate Commands (MSCs) and depots attended the meeting. Appendix A provides a list of attendees. Appendix B contains a list of actions assigned at the meeting. A zipped copy of all the pdf files associated with this set of minutes can be obtained at the EDMS FCG homepage: ftp://www-iea.ria.army.mil/outgoing/ai/eng_data/stricom-minutes.zip .

Day 1: Tuesday, 13 January 1998

MIL-STD-2549 Training

Mr. Lee LeClair of Raytheon, TI Systems, provided the MIL-STD-2549 training session for the ACMS Task Force. Mr. LeClair was instrumental in development of the MIL-STD-2549 data model and has been an advisor to the Configuration Management Advisory Group (CMAG) for the last five years. His briefing covered the following topics:

- Configuration Management (CM) basics,
- MIL-STD-2549 background,
- Putting MIL-STD-2549 on contract, and
- Building interfaces using MIL-STD-2549.

Mr. LeClair opened the training session by placing CM in the appropriate context. He started with the MIL-HDBK-61 definition of CM and broke it down. Please refer to Mr. LeClair's slides on the EDMS FCG homepage.

According to Mr. LeClair, the core requirements for CM are associated with the following key CM activities:

- Identification,

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

- Change Management,
- Configuration Verification and Audit, and
- Status Accounting.

Mr. LeClair described each of these key CM activities. He also summarized what MIL-STD-2549 states the government activities must do in order to accomplish these activities. Lastly, he identified many commonly held fallacies regarding CM. Again, please refer to his briefing for details.

Mr. LeClair concluded this portion of his briefing by describing how CM supports asset management. The implication was that this is the primary reason for performing CM throughout the life of a system.

The following bullets are bits of information provided by Mr. LeClair that are not on his charts:

- CM to the maintenance community is critical because of need to know the as-maintained configuration.
- CM for hardware and software are different primarily because different communities are involved. They are not inherently different.
- Organizations should CM manufacturing documentation, but often do not or only marginally configuration control the manufacturing documentation.
- CM is fundamentally the process of correlating information. It involves matching up documentation with products and includes tracking changes through modification, maintenance, and retrofit.
- Configuration management of hypertext documents requires a new CM paradigm.
 - ⇒ Hypertext documents use pointers and when pointers are used, the owner of the document containing the pointers no longer controls what information is being referenced.
 - ⇒ Essentially, the owner must accept the content of the referenced (linked) document.
 - ⇒ MIL-STD-2549 is not addressing this new CM paradigm at this time.
- Examples of where missing a step of CM during the life of a system have substantial consequences are listed below:
 - ⇒ DOE is currently reverse engineering all the nuclear power plants because they did not keep track of how the plants were built and changed.
 - ⇒ During Desert Storm they needed to make changes to Patriot missiles and had to tear down every missile in order to find out which ones had already been changed. This was expensive and occurred as the U.S. was trying to go to war.

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

- Program Managers often take CM short cuts during acquisition. They arbitrarily decide at what level they will stop tracking configurations based on expected developmental cost savings. Instead, they should determine what items are critical and track them at all levels.
- Most logistics systems do not track the complete identification of items. In particular, they do not track the source identifier of the part number. Because different sources may use the same part number for different parts, this violates the CM uniqueness requirement for identifiers.
- If an item is important or will be important in the future, the item must be uniquely identified within its environment NOW. Uniqueness must be determined universally.
- STEP 203, Configuration Management of Mechanical Parts, does not have unique identification of the item. This violates the fundamental uniqueness premise of CM.
- Interesting Fact -- Apparently, there is a pilot who was assigned to the same B-52 tail number that his grandfather flew.
- MIL-STD-2549 is intended to define DoD's single face to industry for CM data exchange.
- Mr. LeClair doubts that STEP will replace MIL-STD-2549.
- In MIL-STD-2549, a document refers to digital data.
- MIL-STD-2549's presentation (Data Information Packets (DIPs)) is oriented for batch processing. This does not preclude its use for other forms of data exchange.
- Programs may not order CM data by simply referencing MIL-STD-2549. They must tailor the data information packets. This does not preclude referencing MIL-STD-2549 for definition CM data elements that must be manageable by ACMS.
- A program orders MIL-STD-2549 CM data via a CDRL. This is the only way to order CM data via MIL-STD-2549.
- Mr. LeClair believes there is enough information conveyed in MIL-STD-2549 to configuration manage any kind of digital data.
- Mr. LeClair defined a Technical Baseline as the collection of all documents that have to do with a particular product or project. In other words, the Technical Baseline is the project library.
- The mapping of MIL-STD-2549 data elements to data management applications should be done once for the output and once for the input.
- Mr. LeClair suggested that the future of MIL-STD-2549 involved STEP and CORBA. He indicated that there are efforts to harmonize MIL-STD-2549 with STEP. He also would like MIL-STD-2549 get to the point where it

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

references STEP protocols. For example, if STEP eventually defines the minimum essential data exchange, MIL-STD-2549 could replace the DIPs with references to STEP APIs.

- Revision A to MIL-STD-2549 due out in 2.5 years. OSD may push for DoD implementation at that time.

Day 2: Wednesday, 14 January 1998

Summary of CIMdata's ACMS CONOPS Review

Mr. Jim Cox of BDM provided a brief review of comments provided by CIMdata, Inc. against the ACMS CONOPS as it was revised after the November 1997 ACMS Status Meeting. Mr. Cox noted that CIMdata's review was very insightful and worthy of more detailed review by the ACMS Task Force. Mr. Ney indicated that their comments were available on the EDMS FCG web page.

CIMdata's review focused on the ability of the commercial PDM market to support the ACMS CONOPS. A significant theme of CIMdata's comments was that the ACMS CONOPS is generally consistent with the requirements of large discrete multinational enterprises, and that major PDM vendors have or are actively working on the types of capabilities defined in the CONOPS. CIMdata noted, however, that some ACMS requirements would require custom development. Additionally, CIMdata felt that the CONOPS should be considered a long-term strategy and that some of the requirements would only be attainable in the future. CIMdata also commented that the ACMS CONOPS was quite detailed and more like an RFP than a vision document.

The following comments or observations that were raised during Mr. Cox's briefing:

- ACMS should store unclassified metadata for classified product data, but not the classified product data itself.
- The ACMS Performance Specification and CONOPS need to be very careful in their use of the terms revision and version.
- The local implementations of ACMS will need to require vendors to live up to the emerging workflow interface standard. This standard will be used to interface with the JCALS workflow manager and other workflow managers.
- It is anticipated that building an interface to JEDMICS will be quite expensive.

Review of Draft ACMS Requirements

Mr. Ney began the review of the draft ACMS requirements with a few opening remarks. In his remarks, Mr. Ney stated that Mr. Steve French of the Integrated Data Environment (IDE) IPT might be a Department of Army level sponsor for ACMS. Apparently, Mr. French has put in a funding wedge for ACMS in the year 2000 POM. Mr. Ney also indicated that he has begun a dialogue with members of the PEO/PM community on the topic of ACMS. He also asserted that guidance was needed out of AMC headquarters

regarding ACMS.

The actual review of the draft ACMS requirements was broken into four groups of comments: General comments, PDM comments, Data Call comments, and CM Counter Proposal comments. During the Wednesday meeting, the General comments and most of the PDM comments were covered. Refer to Appendix B for specific actions resulting from this review. Also refer to the draft ACMS Performance Specification, which was delivered on 20 January 1998, for documentation of the results of this review.

Day 3: Thursday, 15 January 1998

Review of Draft ACMS Requirements (continued)

During the Thursday review of the draft ACMS requirements, the Task Force completed the review of the comments against the draft PDM requirements. The group also reviewed the comments against the requirements resulting from the earlier ACMS data call. Refer to Appendix B for specific actions resulting from this review. Also refer to the draft ACMS Performance Specification, which was delivered on 20 January 1998, for documentation of the results of this review.

It is important to note that all of the requirements in the draft ACMS Performance Specification may be tailored by each implementing command. In particular, the environment and ownership and support requirements should be tailored to meet local needs. Many of these requirements that will appear in the draft ACMS Performance Specification represent a listing of all possible variations or the minimum or maximum requirement based on inputs from all commands.

The review of the data call requirements included discussion of a particular requirement (D0020) that is relevant to STRICOM. It was requested that these minutes specifically document the decision made by the ACMS Task Force.

- D0020 originally read: “ACMS shall be capable of batch loading data from MEARS/ACCESS.”
- The following was the proposed change going into the meeting: “ACMS shall be capable of an interactive interface with MEARS/ACCESS.”
- It was explained during the meeting that the MEARS/ACCESS combination is actually a legacy data conversion issue and should be handled by STRICOM in their implementation Statement of Work, not in the ACMS Performance Specification. As such, the ACMS Task Force decided to change D0020 to the following: “ACMS shall be capable of dynamic interface with MEARS to exchange engineering change actions and associated metadata.”

Introduction to an EXPRESS model of selected MIL-STD-2549 Data Elements

Mr. Ney presented a model of selected MIL-STD-2549 data elements. Mr. Ney

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

developed this model using the STEP EXPRESS-G modeling language. He introduced the ACMS Task Force to the model and requested comments. Mr. Ney indicated that he has found the EXPRESS-G modeling notation to be easier to follow than the IDEF1X models contained in MIL-STD-2549. He developed the model in the hope that it would be easier for members of the Task Force to understand.

Overview of CECOM's PDM implementation

Mr. Jose Troche from CECOM briefly reviewed CECOM's efforts to implement a PDM system using Auto-Trol's Centra 2000 product. CECOM began its PDM effort in 1995. They reviewed several products, obtain training on some of them, and then selected Auto-Trol based on an evaluation of functionality and user interface. CECOM has maintained a contract with Auto-Trol to fix bugs and tailor the product to CECOM's needs.

CECOM asked VSE to assist in loading TD/CMS data, but after several postponements CECOM loaded the data themselves. About six hundred thousand parts records have been loaded at a rate of 700 to 800 records per minute. Approximately 6 million more records remain to be loaded. Loading part to part relationships is a separate activity. The bottom line is that loading legacy data from TD/CMS requires lots of work.

CECOM intends to use their PDM system as their primary repository. JEDMICS files will be replicated in the CECOM PDM system. CECOM has elected to take the responsibility for keeping JEDMICS up to date without establishing an interface between the two systems. It was determined that building an interface would be too expensive.

At the end of his discussion, Mr. Troche indicated that CECOM was willing to host demonstrations from vendors at their site for the ACMS Task Force.

Presentation of Structure for ACMS Performance Specification

Mr. Cox provided a preview of the draft performance specification's structure. During this review, Mr. Cox identified several pieces of information that the Army needs to provide for inclusion in the ACMS Performance Specification. Related to this request for information, Ms. Carla Crawford requested a copy of Mr. Cox's performance specification structure briefing so she could research some of the Concluding Material information required by MIL-STD-961D. The following list is extracted from the structure briefing:

- Preparing activity and project number,
- Custodians (applies to coordinated specifications),
- Review activities (applies to single department or fully coordinated specifications),
- Industry association interest (if any),
- Civil agency coordinating activities (if any), and
- Agent, if assigned.

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

During Mr. Cox's briefing, it was observed from the audience that with the deletion of the CMIS extract requirements that BDM had prepared, there were no highly visible Tech Loop requirements. To rectify this, the ACMS Task Force took the action to formulate appropriate Tech Loop requirements and forward them to BDM. AMCOM agreed to prepare an initial set of Tech Loop requirements by 23 January 1998. Members of the ACMS Task Force were asked to provide comments by 3 February 1998 and to participate in a follow-up review of all comments via a VENUS conference on 6 February 1998. The final Tech Loop requirements are to be delivered to BDM in time to produce a revised draft ACMS Performance Specification for distribution on 19 February 1998. This revised draft ACMS Performance Specification would include the new Tech Loop requirements, but no other changes.

Day 4: Friday, 16 January 1998

Review of Remaining Schedule

Mr. Ney began the last day with a review of the remaining schedule. This schedule included the Tech Loop requirements action, delivery of the draft ACMS Performance Specification, and the meeting in which the draft ACMS Performance Specification would receive its final review by the ACMS Task Force. The following table lists the dates and milestones or events discussed.

Date	Milestone/Event
23 January 1998	Initial Tech Loop requirements posted on EDMS FCG web page.
30 January 1998	Draft ACMS Performance Specification posted on EDMS FCG web page and available for commenting by MSCs.
3 February 1998	Tech Loop comments and additional Tech Loop requirements due to AMCOM from MSCs.
6 February 1998	VENUS conference to review Tech Loop requirements
13 February 1998	MSC comments on the draft ACMS Performance Specification due to BDM.

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

Date	Milestone/Event
19 February 1998	Consolidated ACMS Performance Specification comments and proposed responses posted on EDMS FCG web page. Updated draft ACMS Performance Specification (30 January version plus Tech Loop requirements) posted on EDMS FCG web page.
24 - 26 February 1998	Final review meeting for draft ACMS Performance Specification.

Review of Draft ACMS Requirements (continued)

The last topic of the January ACMS Status Meeting was the review of the CM counter proposal developed by BDM and Mr. Jim Rickenbaugh who is supporting the EDMS PMO. The counter proposal was developed in response to comments from the EDMS PMO and TACOM-WRN that the CM filtering requirements and the requirements derived from CMIS requirements were too detailed and too implementation oriented. The results of this review have been included in the 30 January 1998 delivery of the draft ACMS Performance Specification.

Meeting Conclusion

Mr. Ney concluded the meeting by thanking all the participants and congratulating them on making the meeting a success. Mr. Ney indicated that the next meeting would be at CBDCOM. See below for details.

Date, Time, Location and Purpose of Next ACMS Task Force Meeting

DATE: 24 to 26 February 1998.

LOCATION: CBDCOM, **Aberdeen**, MD.

PURPOSE OF MEETING: Review Task Force comments written against the draft ACMS Performance Specification (30 January 1998 revision) and summarize the ACMS Task Force's accomplishments for Department of the Army and AMC headquarters representatives.

Appendix A - List of Attendees

13 to 16 January 1998

<i>name</i>	<i>org</i>	<i>off sym</i>	<i>e-mail</i>	<i>phone (com)</i>	<i>phone (dsn)</i>	<i>fax (com)</i>	<i>fax (dsn)</i>
Bender, Mr. John	RIA, Rock Island, IL	SIORI-IMO-D	jbender@ria-emh2.army.mil	(309) 782-4277	793-4277	(309) 782-7788	793-7788
Booker, Ms Gayle	PM EDMS, Redstone Arsenal, AL	AMSAM-CIC-ED-P	gayles@redstone.army.mil	(205) 876-8277	788-8277	(205) 842-7360	788-7360
Carlisle, Ms Cindy	AMCOM, Redstone Arsenal, AL	AMSAM	carlisle-cj@exchange1.redstone.army.mil	788-0867			
Catotti, Mr. Christopher	STRICOM, Orlando, FL	AMSTI-EO	catottic@stricom.army.mil	(407) 380-3913	960-3913		
Cox, Mr. James	BDM		jcox@bdm.com	(703) 848-6739			
Craff, Mr. Alberto	TACOM, Rock Island, IL	AMSTA-AC-AP	acraff@ria-emh2.army.mil	(309) 782-4115	793-4115	(309) 782-4990	793-4990
Crawford, Ms Carla	AMCOM, Redstone Arsenal, AL	AMSAM-RD-SE-TD-	carlac@repos.redstone.army.mil	(205) 842-9821	788-9821	(205) 842-6119	788-6119
Dorchak, Mr. Ed	BDM		edorchak@bdm.com	(703) 848-5740			
Edwards, Mr. Andy	GRIZZLY, Warren, MI	SFAE-GCSS-CM	edwardsa@cc.tacom.army.mil	786-7467			
Ensenat, Mr. Wil	IOC, Rock Island, IL	AMSIO-SME-A	wensenat@ria-emh2.army.mil	(309) 782-5175	793-5175		
Fichter, Mr. Scott	AMCOM, Redstone Arsenal, AL	AMSAM	sfitcher@redstone.army.mil	(205) 313-2138	897-2138		
Goodwin, Mr. Charlie	STRICOM, Orlando, FL	AMSTI-EO	goodwinc@stricom.army.mil	(407) 384-3916	970-3916	(407) 384-3888	
Lasseter, Mr. Gary	AMCOM, Redstone Arsenal, AL	AMSAM	lasseter-gw@redstone.army.mil	(205) 313-2135	897-2135		

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

<i>name</i>	<i>org</i>	<i>off sym</i>	<i>e-mail</i>	<i>phone (com)</i>	<i>phone (dsn)</i>	<i>fax (com)</i>	<i>fax (dsn)</i>
Martinez, Ms Patricia	TACOM, Warren, MI	AMSTA-TR-E/EDI	martinep@cc.tacom.army.mil	(810) 574-6067	786-6067	(810) 574-5666	786-5666
McGlone, Mr. Steven	PM FCIM, Rock Island, IL	AMXSY-T	smcglo@ria-emh2.army.mil	(309) 782-6521	793-6521	(309) 782-7170	793-7170
Medor, Ms Sandra	TACOM, Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	AMSTA-AR-EDE-C	smedor@pica.army.mil	(201) 724-6538	880-6538	(201) 724-5288	880-5288
Meinhart, Mr. Robert	TACOM, Watervliet Arsenal, NY	AMSTA-AR-CCB-EC	meinhart@pica.army.mil	(518) 266-4102	974-4102	(518) 266-3624	974-3624
Ney, Mr. Gordon	AMSAA, Rock Island, IL	AMXSY-T	gney@ria-emh2.army.mil	(309) 782-6586	793-6586	(309) 782-7170	793-7170
Pepper, Mr. John	AMCOM, Redstone Arsenal, AL	AMSAM-RD-SE-TD	jpepper@redstone.army.mil	(205) 876-5003	746-5003	(205) 842-6119	746-6119
Sitroon, Ms Carol	TACOM, Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	AMSTA-AR-EDE-A	csitroon@pica.army.mil	(201) 724-6546	880-6546	(201) 724-5288	880-5288
Smith, Mr. Donald	RRAD, Texarkana, TX	SIORR	dlsmith@redriverad-emh1.army.mil	(903) 334-3823	829-3823	(903) 334-4311	829-4311
Troche, Mr. Jose	CECOM, Ft. Monmouth, NJ	AMSEL-LC-LEO-E	troche@doim6.monmouth.army.mil	(908) 532-8843	992-8843	(908) 532-8759	992-8759
Williamson, Ms Debbie	SRS Tech		debwill@redstone.army.mil	(205) 313-1682	(205) 881-9325		

Appendix B - List of Actions from ACMS Status Meeting

13 to 16 January 1998

Note: This action list includes BDM actions beyond those assigned at the ACMS Status Meeting. The shaded areas represent completed actions. The actions are listed in order of the Action Number. This does not uniformly conform to chronological order.

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee	Action Due Date	Action Status
1	CM Counter Proposal	Send CM Counter Proposal as revised at the Jan 98 meeting and with updated notes.	BDM - Jim	ASAP	Done
2	CM Counter Proposal	Post CM Counter Proposal as revised at the Jan 98 meeting and with updated notes on AMSAA's (IEA's) web site.	Gordon Ney	ASAP	Done
3	Requested Inputs	Provide Carla Crawford with copy of ACMS Performance Specification Structure Briefing (contains information requested by BDM for Concluding Material page).	BDM - Jim	ASAP	Done
4	Requested Inputs	Provide Gordon Ney with information requested by BDM for Concluding Material page.	Carla Crawford	TBD	Done Issues to be resolved
5	Requested Inputs	Provide BDM with requested Concluding Material page information.	Gordon Ney	TBD	Open
6	Tech Loop	Prepare an initial set of candidate Tech Loop requirements based on a review of the extracted CMIS CM requirements (J0001 through J0287).	Gayle Booker	23 Jan 98	Done
7	Tech Loop	Post the initial set of candidate Tech Loop requirements on AMSAA's (IEA's) web site.	Gordon Ney	23 Jan 98	Done
8	Glossary	Add definition of Technical Baseline from MS-2549 to glossary.	BDM - Sandy	30 Jan 98	Done
9	Glossary	Add "access profile" to glossary.	BDM - Sandy & Ed	30 Jan 98	Done
10	Glossary	Add "Transaction Log" to the glossary. Transaction Log. An on-going set of records that updates every time a change is made in the database. It is saved externally to the system and contains sufficient information that the system may be restored from a backup or archive.	BDM - Sandy	30 Jan 98	Done
11	Glossary	Add the following to the Glossary: Dynamic Interface. A real-time, background exchange of data.	BDM - Sandy	30 Jan 98	Done

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee	Action Due Date	Action Status
12	Check Rqt	Search ACMS CONOPS for requirement to store data in a non-versioned vault. Relates to P1.3.2.	BDM - Sandy	30 Jan 98	Done Para # 5.2.1.1, Working Data
13	Draft Perf Spec	Deliver Draft ACMS Performance Specification.	BDM - Team	30 Jan 98	Done!
14	Draft Perf Spec	Post Draft ACMS Performance Specification on AMSAA's (IEA's) web site.	Gordon Ney	30 Jan 98	Done
15	Draft Perf Spec	Change "forms" to "displays" on P1.2.1	BDM - Sandy	30 Jan 98	Done
16	Draft Perf Spec	Revise language of P1.3.5 as stated in rqt-revs.doc and move P1.3.5 to be next to P8.11.	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done except for the move
17	New Rqts	Develop new requirements following revised P1.3.6.2 that deal with conceptually dividing the vault (a.k.a., partitioning the vault), routing data to default partitions, and allowing users to override default routings (P1.3.6.3, P1.3.6.4, and P1.3.6.5). Refer to MIL-STD-2549 (DED 209) and rqt-revs.doc.	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
18	Draft Perf Spec	Improve the consistency in which selected words are used in the draft requirements and review requirements for definitions to add to Glossary (e.g., document, revision, version, vault, etc.).	BDM - Global: Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
19	Draft Perf Spec	Use the term "document" in the MIL-STD-2549 sense.	BDM - Global: Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
20	Draft Perf Spec	Consider replacing the phrase "parts/components/assemblies/end items" with "product structure elements."	BDM - Global: Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
21	Draft Perf Spec	Investigate MIL-STD-2549's use of the terms version and revision. Decide how best to use them in the Draft ACMS Performance Specification.	BDM - Global: Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
22	Draft Perf Spec	Consider replacing the word "files" with data or document (decide which) throughout the specification.	BDM - Global: Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
23	Draft Perf Spec	Develop a web security requirement for protection from hacking.	Paul Behrens	13 Feb 98	Open

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee	Action Due Date	Action Status
24	Draft Perf Spec	Change category of P1.3.7.2 to reflect merging with P1.3.7.1. (Lock Checked Out Data)	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
25	Draft Perf Spec	Make P1.3.7.6 consistent with P1.3.6.2. (Specify Check-Out Location)	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
26	Draft Perf Spec	Modify the category of P1.5.1.1 to reflect change from "classification" to "grouping."	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
27	Draft Perf Spec	Change "classifications" in P1.5.1.2 to "groupings," modify the category to reflect the change, and look for other places where the term "classification" is used.	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
28	Draft Perf Spec	Make P1.6 and P1.7 siblings under the category Release Management per comments at Jan 98 meeting. P1.6 (Support Electronic Approvals) P1.7 (Track Revision and Release Status)	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
29	Draft Perf Spec	Re-address the old P1.7 in light of the resolution of revision and version. Also check to see if P1.7 is redundant.	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
30	Draft Perf Spec	Modify P1.8.1 to clarify the requirement in light of the definitions for "full add information" and "full delete information." "Full add and delete information" implies the system captures a complete record of the record that changes. "From/to change information" implies the system only captures the from and to information for the fields that change and the values of the fields that are the record keys.	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
31	Draft Perf Spec	Consider developing a new requirement located around P3.1.7 or P3.1.11 (which is deleted). This new requirement should say something like, "ACMS shall provide the capability to define a baseline based on a particular baseline freeze [or effectivity] date." Compare this requirement to C0022. P1.3.7-new (Define Baseline Freeze)	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
32	Draft Perf Spec	Reconsider P3.1.4 in light of the resolution of the version/revision issue.	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee	Action Due Date	Action Status
33	Draft Perf Spec	Reconsider P3.1.6 in light of the resolution of the version/revision issue. The resolution may affect the phrase, "configuration of a product." Depending on how the issue is resolved, a particular configuration of a product may correspond 1 to 1 to a particular revision or version of a product.	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
34	Draft Perf Spec	Move revised P6.1.2 to Interface section. Check for duplicates.	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
35	Draft Perf Spec	In lieu of P6.1.5 in the Interface section, consider having a TBD interface requirement in the Interface section. <Adopted Booker's comment with some modification. P6.1.5 was already destined for the Interface section. Deleted P8.5 as a duplicate.>	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
36	Draft Perf Spec	Make sure the ACMS Performance Specification has requirements that ensure ACMS has visibility into data managed by other systems. Visibility, not control. (1-23-98) Consider the following 3 new requirements to be located in Section 3.1.1.1.4, Data Locating Requirements. They are broken up because it will be necessary to phase them in and should be identified as future requirements in Section 6 (see action #48). (P3.2.0.1 to P3.2.0.3). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACMS shall provide the capability to locate, display, search, and navigate product structures which are stored by ACMS sites that are not the user's host ACMS site. ACMS shall provide the capability to located product data which are stored by ACMS sites that are not the user's host ACMS site. ACMS shall provide the capability to retrieve product data which are stored by ACMS sites that are not the user's host ACMS site. 	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
37	Draft Perf Spec	Revise sequence of requirements from P8.2.6 to P8.2.15. See the language in rqt-revs.doc. (P8.2.7-1 to P8.2.7-6).	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee	Action Due Date	Action Status
38	Draft Perf Spec	Change the definition of COOP in P8.4.3 to Continuity of Operations Plan.	BDM - Sandy	30 Jan 98	Done
39	Draft Perf Spec	Check P8.8.2 against the general API requirement (the revised P6.1.2).	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
40	Draft Perf Spec	Move P12.1 to the category User Interfaces. P12.2 to P12.5 were deleted at the Jan meeting.	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
41	Draft Perf Spec	Change the category of D0011 to User Skills. (different solution)	BDM - Sandy	30 Jan 98	Done
42	Draft Perf Spec	Create a D0020-NEW1 and D0020-NEW2 for ECALS and CARS. See action 80.	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
43	Draft Perf Spec	Add the following parenthetical remark to the end of D0022 and D0023: (This requirement should be tailored by the implementing command at the time of acquisition.) Check the interface TBD place holders for possible duplication. Incorporated D0022 into P6.1.2 and D0023 into P8.8.1.	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done
44	Draft Perf Spec	Locate an environmental parameter for "Refresh Time." This has to do with refreshing data among distributed databases. (see D0024) Created a new requirement as D0025.	BDM – Jim [enter directly into RTS]	30 Jan 98	Done
45	Draft Perf Spec	Include in Section 6 of the Draft ACMS Performance Specification a statement that the SOW need to include statements requiring current technology, strategy for incorporation of future technology, and Technology Refresh in contract.	BDM - Margot	30 Jan 98	Done
46	Draft Perf Spec	Leave the draft requirement identifiers (e.g., P1.1) somewhere with the requirement in the Draft ACMS Performance Specification.	BDM - Margot & Sandy	30 Jan 98	Done
47	Draft Perf Spec	Move C0028 to beginning of CM requirements. Alternative to consider. Move C0028 to the Interface section. Message out to Gordon and Gayle on this (1-23-98). Put in both places via reference. POC0028.	BDM - Margot	30 Jan 98	Done
48	Draft Perf Spec	Add a note to section 6 that identifies which requirements should be deferred. e.g., C0002.	BDM - Margot & Jim	30 Jan 98	Done

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee	Action Due Date	Action Status
49	Draft Perf Spec	Create the following new Ownership and Support requirement: ACMS restorations from backups shall take no longer than TBD hours given a database of TBD records. <i>[enter directly into RTS] (see D0017-1)</i>	BDM - Margot & Jim, and Patricia Martinez	30 Jan 98	Done
50	Draft Perf Spec	Research and provide a benchmark for system restoral time (non-catastrophic). <i>(see AI # 49 for location of result)</i>	BDM - Jim, and Patricia Martinez	30 Jan 98	Done
51	Tech Loop	Comment on the initial set of candidate Tech Loop requirements and add additional Tech Loop requirements as needed. Provide comments to AMCOM (Gayle Booker????).	ACMS Task Force Members	3 Feb 98	Done
52	Tech Loop	Review Tech Loop requirements at a VTC.	ACMS Task Force Members	6 Feb 98	Done
53	Comments	Reconsider original comment against P3.1.7. Need to fully specify "etc."	Gayle Booker	13 Feb 98	Open
54	Comments	Need to clarify the following comment made by Jim Rickenbaugh against P4.1: "Need to indicate that WBS is applicable only to contract related cost and schedule."	Gayle Booker	13 Feb 98	Open
55	Comments	Investigate suitability of combining P1.5.3.2 and P1.5.3.4. If they should, write a comment to that effect. Note: P1.5.3.2 should include links between product structure elements and product data.	BDM - Margot	13 Feb 98	Open
56	Comments	Write a comment to modify and split the revised P1.2.3 (revised at the Jan 98 meeting).	BDM - Jim	13 Feb 98	Open
57	Tech Loop	Package Tech Loop requirements and deliver to BDM in electronic form.	Gordon Ney	13 Feb 98	Open
58	Comments	Consider possible wording to include "order of change action implementation" in draft performance requirement C0024.	ACMS Task Force	13 Feb 98	Open

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee	Action Due Date	Action Status
59	Comments	Develop global relationship requirement(s). See notes associated with the CM Counter Proposal (cm-cntr2.doc). This either has to do with C0020 and a global statement that allows for recording all documentation and relationships, or C0031 to C0033 (to include those deleted) and a global requirement to create and track CM activities. It is not clear what the group wanted.	Patricia Martinez, Gayle Booker, and possibly others	13 Feb 98	Open
60	Comments	Investigate possibility of a requirement to support disposal and obsolescence.	Gayle Booker	13 Feb 98	Open
61	Comments	Specify required time to recover from a catastrophe. This would go under the Ownership and Support section.	ACMS Task Force by Command	13 Feb 98	Open
62	Comments	Provide written comments on the Draft ACMS Performance Specification and provide to BDM electronically.	ACMS Task Force Members	13 Feb 98	Open
63	Tech Loop	Deliver revised Draft ACMS Performance Specification (= old Draft ACMS Performance Specification + Tech Loop requirements).	BDM - Team	19 Feb 98	Open
64	Comments	Deliver consolidated Draft ACMS Performance Specification comments and responses.	BDM - Team	19 Feb 98	Open
65	Review	Post revised Draft ACMS Performance Specification, consolidated comments, and responses on AMSAA's (IEA's) web site.	Gordon Ney	19 Feb 98	Open
66	Review	Attend review of Draft ACMS Performance Specification, consolidated comments, and responses (location - TBD).	ACMS Task Force Members and BDM - Jim & Ed	24 - 26 Feb 98	Open
67	Comments	Write a comment to delete the revised C0021 as duplicated by C0015.	BDM	13 Feb 98	Open
68	Comments	Write a comment to delete P1.5.2.1 as a duplicate of P1.5.4, P3.1.2, and P3.1.3.	BDM	13 Feb 98	Open
69	Glossary	Write definitions for additional types of data named in P1.2.1.	BDM	13 Feb 98	Open
70	Comments	Write a comment to delete P1.5.4 as a duplicate of P1.5.2.1. Note: Where used is covered in P3.2.2.	BDM	13 Feb 98	Open
71	Comments	Write a comment to delete P2.4 as a duplicate of P2.2 and P2.1.6/P2.1.12. See also P5.1 to P5.4.	BDM	13 Feb 98	Open

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee	Action Due Date	Action Status
72	Comments	Consider writing a comment to delete P2.5.1 as a duplicate of P1.6. Note: Wording of P2.5.1 does not mention workflow. P1.6 may need to mention workflow.	BDM	13 Feb 98	Open
73	Comments	Explore the potential duplication between P3.1.1 and P3.1.9 as revised.	BDM	13 Feb 98	Open
74	Comments	Consider writing a comment that challenges the notion of needing to partition vaults as described in P1.3.6.2 through P1.3.6.4	BDM	13 Feb 98	Open
75	Comments	Write a comment against P3.1.7 to at least change it to "multiple product structure baselines." Also, consider splitting in two and placing the multiple baselines portion next to C0022.	BDM	13 Feb 98	Open
76	Comments	Write a comment to delete the second sentence of P6.2.2 as duplicative of P6.1.4.	BDM	13 Feb 98	Open
77	Comments	Check P8.8.3 for duplication with P6.1.5. Write a comment if necessary.	BDM	13 Feb 98	Open
78	Comments	<i>Delete P9.1 in order to be consistent with direction from Jan 98 meeting to delete P9.2.</i>	<i>BDM</i>	<i>30 Jan 98</i>	<i>Done</i>
79	Comments	Write a comment to delete D0015 as a duplicate of P10.1 and P10.2. Note: May want to keep D0015 and delete the others. Investigate D0016 as well.	BDM	13 Feb 98	Open
80	Minutes	Put in the meeting minutes that legacy data conversion for MEARS/ACCESS is a STRICOM SOW statement, not a performance specification requirement. See also Action 42.	BDM	TBD	Open
81	Requested Input	Reference Action #4. Coordinate with Jim Knowles on Concluding Materials information.	Gordon Ney	5 Feb 98	Open
82	<i>Draft Perf Spec</i>	<i>Develop a list of Subject Terms (Key Words) for Section 6.4.</i>	<i>BDM - Jim & Margot</i>	<i>30 Jan 98</i>	<i>Done</i>
83	Comments	Consider writing a comment to eliminate P1.3.4 in light of the P8.2 series of requirements.	BDM - Jim	13 Feb 98	Open
84	Comments	Consider making the connection between P1.5.1.1/P1.5.1.2 and P1.5.2.2 clearer.	BDM - Jim	13 Feb 98	Open

ACMS Status Meeting Minutes

13 - 16 January 1998

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee	Action Due Date	Action Status
85	Comments	Consider revising P2.1.4 to just be time-out rules (which make sense under Workflow Definition Requirements) and create separate, new requirements under Workflow Execution Requirements for voting (see P2.5.2), commenting, and routing. Put the new ones after P2.5.2.	BDM - Jim	13 Feb 98	Open
86	Comments	Consider writing a comment to split P2.1.11, so that we can mark the progress of the workflow portion as a current (not future) requirement.	BDM - Jim	13 Feb 98	Open
87	Comments	Write a comment that adds the phrase, “(This requirement should be tailored by the implementing command at the time of acquisition.), to D0001 and D0004 through D0007.	BDM - Jim	13 Feb 98	Open
88	Comments	Review workflow requirements associated with PDM, CM, and Tech Loop to ensure it is possible to reuse the data from a previous instance of a workflow. The Army wants to be able to reuse both workflow templates (already covered) and reuse data from a previously executed workflow.	BDM - Jim	13 Feb 98	Open
89	Comments	Review paragraphs in Sctn 1 and appendices for treatment of core data. Need to remove notion of core data in favor of only specifying the data exchange requirements via MS-2549 DIPs.	BDM - Jim	13 Feb 98	Open
90	Comments	Draft a comment to better include Tech Loop needs in P1.8.1 (??). Relates to ARDEC Tech Loop requirement, New ARDEC 5.	Carol Sitroon	13 Feb 98	Open
91	Comments	Review the requirements under 3.2.1 to see which should be changed from “batch loading” to “batch loading without human intervention.”	ACMS Task Force	13 Feb 98	Open